

The Sun

SUNDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1913.

Entered at the Post Office at New York as Second Class Matter.

Subscriptions by Mail, Postpaid.

DAILY, Per Month	\$0 50
DAILY, Per Year	6 00
SUNDAY, Per Year	2 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Year	8 00
DAILY AND SUNDAY, Per Month	75

THE EVENING SUN, Per Month..... 25
THE EVENING SUN, Per Year..... 2 50

Postage to foreign countries added.
All checks, money orders, etc., to be made payable to THE SUN.

Published daily, including Sunday, by the Sun Printing and Publishing Association at 170 Nassau street, in the Borough of Manhattan, New York.
President and Treasurer, William C. Beck, 170 Nassau street, New York.
Secretary, Edward P. Mitchell, 170 Nassau street, New York.
C. E. Lutton, 170 Nassau street.

London office, 11, Abchurch Lane, E. C. 4, Strand, London, E. C.
Paris office, 6, rue de la Michodière, off rue du Centre-Séverin.
Washington office, 1115 Building.
Brooklyn office, 106 Livingston street.

If our friends who favor us with manuscripts and illustrations for publication wish to have returned articles returned they must in all cases send stamps for that purpose.

The last shift: To course the Court.

Bad Advice From General Sherman About Mexico.

Representative SHERWOOD of Ohio was not so faithful a supporter of President Wilson's Mexican policy as he believed himself to be when he said in the House on Friday that "one of three courses is open to us": to raise the embargo on arms, to intervene, or to share with other nations a military protectorate over Mexico until a stable Government is established.

Public opinion would not tolerate the last course for a moment; to allow the exportation of munitions of war to Mexico would be equivalent to promoting the cause of the Constitutionalists, with the probable result that American citizens would be in greater peril than ever—our army officers, by the way, have sounded the warning that if we allow arms to go into Mexico freely they may in the end be used against us; and intervention should be the last resort, when no other course remains.

It does not seem to occur to public men of a certain type that Mr. Wilson's policy of neutrality between the combatants has at least an even chance of working out successfully and perhaps very soon. If the Constitutional cause is as strong as it is represented to be, and if the Huerta Government is stumbling to a fall, as many believe, the end may come as swiftly as the retirement of PORRIÑO DIAZ came. At any rate, this seems to be no time to talk of intervention or of pouring rifles, cartridges and field guns into Mexico. Has it ever occurred to military men like General SHERWOOD that to the cost of armed intervention, that is to say, of war, the charges of an enormous pension list would have to be added?

Is Mrs. Pankhurst an Undesirable?

Mrs. EMILINE PANKHURST, the leader of the English militant suffragettes, whom a special board of inquiry at Ellis Island yesterday pronounced an "undesirable" on the ground that the felony of which she was convicted in England last April "involved moral turpitude," is no stranger to this country. She came over in 1909 and again in 1911 and spoke for her cause at several meetings, one of them in Carnegie Hall. Her ventures were remunerative; no less than \$5,000 was raised at her last meeting on January 7, 1911, under the auspices of the Women's Political Union. She then said: "We are fighting a civil war. That is the only way to describe it. It is a holy war. It will be waged until the victory is won, no matter what the cost."

In Mrs. PANKHURST's favor it is to be said that she never urged American women to resort to militant tactics in order to win the suffrage, and before leaving England to make another lecturing tour in the United States she said that she would adhere to her policy of letting American women fight the battle in their own way. Her purpose was to raise funds for the cause in England; and she had a promise of \$1,500 for her first appearance on the lecture platform. Mrs. PANKHURST is a practical woman as well as a crusader. A statement of intention to arouse American women to destroy property and assault public men for the good of the cause would certainly have prejudiced her claim for admission to this country.

Two convictions have been obtained against Mrs. PANKHURST in England. She was tried in May, 1912, with Mr. and Mrs. PETER LAWRENCE in the Old Bailey on a charge of conspiring to incite to commit malicious mischief. All three defendants were found guilty and received sentences of nine months imprisonment. The jury recommended leniency "on account of the undoubtedly pure motive underlying their agitation." A more serious charge was preferred against Mrs. PANKHURST in April of this year, that of being party to a conspiracy to destroy a house at Walton Heath, supposed to belong to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, DAVID LLOYD GEORGE, who is a friend to woman suffrage but not active enough in the cause to suit Mrs. PANKHURST. This trial was also held in the Old Bailey, and while other evidence was introduced a declaration made by the defendant in a speech at Cardiff that she assumed responsibility for the bomb explosion at Walton Heath alone made her conviction possible. Mrs. PANKHURST, for that instance counted martyrdom, for there was no independent evidence that she was a party to the outrage. Jus-

the LUSH sentenced her to three years imprisonment at hard labor.

A comparatively brief hearing at Ellis Island yesterday convinced the board of inquiry that the felony of which Mrs. PANKHURST stands convicted involved moral turpitude and that under the amended law of 1911 she must be excluded as an "undesirable." The case is to be taken into the Federal courts and may be carried up to the Supreme Court. Moral turpitude is an elastic term, and felonies differ in character and degree. It may be inseparable from the statute crime, or it may be implied from the offense. The felony of which Mrs. PANKHURST was convicted if proved directly against her would involve moral turpitude. Does the fact that her confession of responsibility was voluntary, perhaps fanatical, and in a sense political, make a difference? It is for our courts to decide this question.

The English Player Who Scorns Us and Passes Us By.

New York theatergoers should not be sensitive to the criticisms of the visiting English actor who has refused to come to this city because he regards our taste in the theatre as too low to make the visit worth his while. The achievements of this English interpreter of SHAKESPEARE will be witnessed in many other cities but not in the metropolis. It is now customary for English singers and actors to appear only in the cities of Canada, since there are enough of them to make a visit to that country alone sufficiently profitable, and the certain favor of these smaller communities is preferred to the risk of not pleasing more exacting audiences in the larger towns.

As a matter of fact, the particular actor who has so arranged his tour of the United States as to avoid New York is accustomed to playing in provincial cities. In England his time is devoted more to the towns out of London than to the metropolis of England. It would have been fatal to his prosperity in this country had he failed to meet with the approval of the New York public. Had he brought his actors here to find that they did not attain to the standards of the metropolis, his success in other cities would have been endangered. So other reasons than our alleged lack of taste for the serious drama may have led him to keep away from Manhattan Island.

Had the company reached New York at any time during the last month there would have been sufficient rivalry to convince the contemptuous visitor that under certain conditions New York finds pleasure in the highest forms of dramatic art. JOHNSTON, FORBES-ROBERTSON is now playing to large audiences. In the huge theatre on the West Side in which they have elected to present their Shakespearean plays, JULIA MARLOWE and E. H. SOUTHERN are greeted every night by audiences that fill the playhouse and receive their offerings with flattering cordiality. These are not the only actors in worthy plays who are just now enjoying the cordial support of the New York public.

So we need not feel too deeply the snub that the English actor has inflicted on us. There are musical shows, often English importations, and there may be cabarets here. Yet it is consoling to know that this is not the only metropolis which supports such means of entertainment. They are to be found all over the world. There never was a time in which it could not be conclusively proved that the stage had never before sunk to so low a level. FRANCISQUE SARGE prepared a most enlightening list of publications on that theme covering more than two centuries. The words of this exclusive and eclectic player should not be allowed to rankle too deeply in our patriotic breasts.

Mr. Bryan Expounds the New Greenbackism.

Since former Senator ALDRICH made his powerful attack a few days ago on the new Greenbackers who have had their way so far with the currency bill, persons who do not like Mr. ALDRICH have been attempting to defend the provisions of the bill for a Government note issue which will put the country in the way of progress toward that fiat money for which WILLIAM J. BRYAN has been contending all his political life. Some of this defence has come from quarters ordinarily credited with intelligence enough to know the difference between sound and unsound money, and the efforts to swallow the Bryanism of the currency bill have been obviously strained. The speech which Mr. BRYAN made at Waterloo, Iowa, last Friday is not calculated to assist the act of deglutition.

It has been asserted in behalf of the note issue clauses of the currency measure that the provision for making the Federal Government is merely an objectionable touch of Bryanism, not to be taken seriously. Mr. BRYAN takes it seriously, however. It has been explained that all the language used to make the notes a Government issue is only language to placate the Bryanites and is utterly meaningless so far as regards the actual character of the notes themselves. Mr. BRYAN does not understand it that way. It has been argued that the process of getting the projected notes into circulation is quite identical with the process by which the present bank notes are taken out, the Government merely issuing them to the banks on application. This might go as an argument if anybody regarded the present process as in the form of a loan from the Government to the banks, which is precisely how Mr. BRYAN construes the note issue contemplated. All the delusions about the nature of money and all the confusion of money with promises to pay money

which are summed up in the word Bryanism are exhibited in Mr. BRYAN's Waterloo address. He said:

"By the provisions of the new bill the Government loans money without requiring bonds. This enables the Government to put into a community more money than it takes out. The Government asks in return something that every banker should be willing to concede, namely, that the Government should issue the money itself. Why let the banks issue the money in times of peace, when the Government must issue it in time of trouble? The President has taken the position that the Government should issue the money, and I think he is right. I also believe the banks will have to concede this point whether they want to or not."

There is a declaration which should curb any disposition to explain away the fiat money of the currency bill as a verbal masquerade, or to defend the provision for Government notes as safely removed from the region of fiat money.

These notes are explicitly declared to be "obligations of the United States," and although they are only promises to pay money, Mr. BRYAN says they are money itself. He calls them a Government issue of money, but in spite of what he calls them they are Government promises to pay put out in the names of banks. They are secured by reserves not of gold alone but of other promises to pay and are redeemable not in gold only but in other promises to pay. The Government is not regarded by Mr. BRYAN as simply the custodian of a process of putting into circulation acceptable promissory notes but as the purveyor and lender of real money.

How can any one afford to indorse the note issue provisions of the currency bill when they are thus interpreted to the public by the apostle of fiat money, who has been sufficiently powerful to have his notions of money incorporated in the bill? Could anything be more effectively devised to start the country on the road to fiat money and make popular delusion prevail than the device which Mr. BRYAN is already expounding to the people in the amazing terms just cited? Literary plaudits of the Bryanites is risky business in currency legislation.

What Mr. Mitchell Realizes.

Harper's Weekly appears this week containing the subjoined eulogium upon the Hon. JOHN PURDY MITCHELL:

"He believes in those changes in which the most intelligent thinkers believe, but he fully realizes that they can be made only under right conditions."

Let us test this statement by a single sentence which also appeared on the same day to give us a true conception not only as to what "the most intelligent thinkers believe," but also as to how far and in what manner the Fusion candidate for Mayor of this town "fully realizes" what are "right conditions."

At a Madison street meeting on the East Side Mr. MITCHELL addressed an audience almost wholly made up of foreigners, and apropos of the conviction of WILLIAM SULZER, which had occurred a few hours earlier, Mr. MITCHELL sensed the temper of his hearers with this utterance:

"We have the spectacle of MORPHY reaching into the Executive chair and dragging from it the Governor of the State, not because of the merits of the case or because of the things SULZER did, but of the things he refused to do for MORPHY."

There was no quibbling in this grave revelation of Mr. MITCHELL's political character whereby at one stroke he fore a foreign audience he openly insulted and impugned the integrity of the highest court of this State's judicial system: WILLIAM SULZER was convicted and removed, "not because of the merits of the case or because of the things SULZER did."

Let the rational citizens of this town weigh those measured words and ask themselves if a young man is safe and law abiding who recklessly tells an audience of foreigners that the highest court in his State is corrupt, subject to pressure and without integrity, and that it removed the Governor of this State not on the merits of his case or because of the things he did.

This candidate has assured other audiences that he is not a socialist. We now agree with him. The question is whether or not he is preaching anarchy. How else could his East Side supporters interpret such words?

The Deedist School.

We have no disposition to refuse to Minnesota the credit which the St. Paul Pioneer Press gives it of having been a leader "in the movement to better the efficiency of the rural schools," and we admit regretfully that the one room schoolhouse at the "country cross roads is doomed to disappear," as the United States Bureau of Education prophesies.

We deny respectfully but insistently that that schoolhouse, the schoolhouse of our daddies and granddaddies, was the "red schoolhouse," as our Gopher contemporary calls it. "The little red schoolhouse" has and has not an undeserved glory. It knew a mighty hour in Illinois politics. If we remember, "Red" is the traditional, legendary, hereditary painting of it. Red it may have been in parts of the West or elsewhere. It was of all colors and none, weather beaten, largely innocent of paint, capable of dingy whiteness, unpainted, just as time, fate and the deedist committee-men decided or allowed.

It was small, barren, hot, cold, stuffy, rude, much maltreated by barbarian children; the stove funnel made the Meanderer look straight; the light air stove (when it didn't smoke) was usually a chestnut burner, so to speak, profuse in explosions followed by strappings, rattlings, or else ferullings with a "ruler."

Survivors of the antique race, have

you ever been subjected to that awful pleasing punishment of being made to sit on "the girls' side"? Have you been imprisoned in the dark closet? Have you sported the fool's cap?

Doddering ancients of the deedist school, have you fought the boys of some other deedist with fists and "rocks"? If you survive, you are of the toughest and most viable. Off have you bled at nose, oft have you been "whaled" by unforgiving teachers, but you probably got the three. Its with a thoroughness the wisest youngsters of to-day don't bring to any of their encyclopedic studies.

The future historian will do me justice.—WILLIAM SULZER.
Let us hope not.

False dignity is about the poorest investment a man can make.—The Secretary of State in the Commencer.

False dignity risks up "no sale" on the cash register. A poor investment? Well, we should say it is. It is unable to earn \$2.50, let alone \$250 and "half the rate." But since when did dignity become an investment? Next we know the old New England adage will read: Policy is the best honesty.

A Mayor of New York has to be a Mayor for all of the people, no matter of what nation, race or color.—The Hon. JOHN PURDY MITCHELL.

What a novel conception. Where is the office of the Mayor of New York? It is in the City Hall. Is the cat on the mat? Yes, the cat is on the mat. A Mayor of New York has to be a Mayor for all of the people. That will do for to-day.

Secretary DANIELS says he is gratified that ENSIGN GODFREY CHEVALIER of the navy has been cleared of the charge of intoxication preferred against him by a Baltimore Doughty and thrown out by a grand jury. Certainly no aviator, or Mr. CHEVALIER is one of the brightest young men of the naval flying corps, can afford to tipple; in fact, no aviator in either the army or navy should be allowed to touch alcohol.

President WILSON to-day gave the lie to reports of his ill health by playing golf all this morning in a drizzling rain.—Washington Herald.

That is not conclusive. A drizzle is nothing to your true golfer. If Mr. WILSON wants to prove that he is fit he must play in a thunderstorm or during a seismic disturbance.

Can France's condolences be sincere? Germany built the Zeppelins with the sole object of dropping death and destruction on as many Frenchmen as possible, however much she might after war be declared.—Herald.

There is something in this point of view, inhuman as it seems. It is not a passenger carrier, but a great engine of war designed to slay its thousands. Perhaps it would have been as well for the Paris Journal to hold its peace, but Frenchmen can shed only crocodile tears over the news from the Berlin aeronautic field.

Pankhurst Militancy.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Permit me to ask Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont to explain what surely appears to be inconsistent. We are always being told in the columns of the Sun that Mrs. PANKHURST and her followers "are not interested in or sympathetic with militancy."

Will Mrs. Belmont now explain why we should welcome with such honor Great Britain's prize firebrand and disturber of the peace, pouring into her hands our good American money, just to enable her to return home and carry on with renewed vigor and vigor her dangerous work? That is what it comes to, if we have no interest in militancy.

It does not seem to occur to Mrs. Belmont that the good that money might do right here in this country if diverted into different channels than the muddy waters of Pankhurst militancy.

What an outcry would be heard in New York did a crowd of men flock to hear a New York Black Hander who had declared the box receipts would be used to purchase dynamite! R. A. LAWRENCE.
PLAINFIELD, N. J., October 17.

The Two Readings.

A well known Parisian antiquary, while on his holiday in Normandy, came across an old farm with a curious carving in the form of an armorial bearing over one of the stable doors. Beneath the carving was a wooden sign inscribed with a date. Examining it closely he found the latter to be 1831. All his antiquarian passions were aroused, needless to say, and after some bargaining the farmer sold him the carving for quite a nice sum.

The next day the farmer brought the trouvaille to the antiquary's villa. "This isn't what I bought," exclaimed the purchaser. "It bears the date of 1831. I don't want it." "Excuse me, sir," replied the farmer, "the same, right enough. But the farmer who recently repaired it replaced the last letter with an 'e'."

Put it right, you say? The antiquary was sporting enough not to back on his bargain, but the facts of the case do not seem to speak highly of his antiquarian knowledge.

From the London Chronicle.

Emerson's period of literary production might have been considerably longer had he not been so much interested in the subject of the *Lancet*. In one of Mr. H. J. Warner's letters to his wife he writes: "We are all human and we all need cheering cups—but not at breakfast! It was at breakfast that I broke down Emerson; premature, no human being, however well, can live long and keep his mind unclouded on pie at breakfast. Emerson lost his mind—or memory—at a much earlier period than he would have been likely to lose it owing to the vicious habit of pie at breakfast."

At Albany.

To-day shall a great Commonwealth wear laurel. Let these be put away. The wreaths of laurel and the hands of bay. All gaude and garlands of triumphant hue! Shams within the pillared porticoes. While honor lies dethroned, debased and slain! Sooth, what are open foes. To those that lurk within the inner fane! They menace in the light. While those, those others, like a thief at night. With panther foot creep in and pilage and profane!

Great shades, wh'er ye dwell, Who have put on the crowns of immortality. Who served the State of Empire from the roar Of Niagara to Montauk's sand and shore, Marcy and Tilden, Cleveland—he with us In this hour ominous!—We will use ye with courage, with the mail Of higher manhood, lest we faint and fall In hope and faith and trust. That over greed and lust The might of Right shall gloriously prevail! CLINTON SCOLLARD.

THE SACERDOTAL VIEW.

Why Episcopal Clergymen May Not Unite With Others.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: "Presbyterianism" letter on church unity raises a question which should be answered frankly. He wishes to know why the clergy of the Episcopal Church do not unite with "Presbyterian or Methodist or Congregational preachers" in sacramental services. If he will refer to the Prayer Book, page 599, he will find this statement:

It is evident upon all men, diligently reading Holy Scripture and ancient Authors, that from the Apostles' time there have been these Orders of Ministers in Christ's Church: Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. Which offices were ever held in such reverent estimation, that no man might presume to execute any of them, except he were first called, tried, examined, and known to have such qualities as are requisite for the same, as by public Prayer, with Imposition of Hands, were approved and admitted thereto by lawful Authority. And therefore, to the intent that these Orders might be continued, and reverently used and esteemed in this Church, no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, in this Church, or suffered to execute any of the said Functions, until he be lawfully called, tried, examined, and admitted thereto, according to the Form hereafter following, or hath had Episcopal Consecration or Ordination.

This is perfectly clear: it is the sacred, dogmatic conception of the Christian ministry, which the Presbyterian brother rejects, ex animo. He will discover, if he reads the ordinal, that one of the functions committed to the priest at his ordination is that of "consecrating the holy sacraments (bread and wine) for the use of the Church." One of these sacraments, holy baptism, is declared to work the regeneration of those who receive it (page 249); another, holy communion, is called "the blessed sacrament of the body and blood of Christ" (page 248); "our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" (page 236), wherein comes "the strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the body and blood of Christ" (page 249); and "the bread and wine" (page 272). All this is patently opposed by Protestantism. My Presbyterian brother might blushingly deny that he is a priest, but I can fancy his indignant repudiation of the title priest. (He would probably go so far as to deny not only he was a priest, but that we were.) Why, then, should he complain that he is not permitted to participate in sacerdotal ministrations?

It is, I suppose, generally known that a Protestant minister seeking the priesthood at the hands of one of our bishops is declared to be a "heretic" and is expelled from the ranks of the ministry. The bishop's hands, continues his studies, passes his examinations, is ordered deacon, and in course of time is ordained priest. A Roman Catholic priest wishing to become a minister among us, gives evidence of his character, scholarship and convictions, and is thereupon received with no further ordination.

Can we earnestly pray that they all may be one? I am ready to "accept" everything distinctively "Protestant Episcopalism" to that end, though it is not a question of giving up, but of conceding to the common stock of the Catholic constitution of the Church and the fullness of the apostolic faith are not ours to sacrifice or impair. They are sacred trusts, to be maintained unimpaired. And this, please God, we mean to do.

WILLIAM HERMAN VAN ALLEN.
CHURCH OF THE ADVENT, Boston, October 17.

Church Unity.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Some two thousand years ago a cynical rhetorician asked the question, "What is truth?" and he answered satisfactorily to the multitude by saying, "I am." But the question comes along Mr. "Presbyterian" with his query in the SUN, "What do you mean by church unity?" He knows full well that he can not reply in such a manner as to be acceptable to the great body of professing Christians. St. Paul's formula, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," is obsolete, for it presupposes a body of believers working in unity toward a common end, and in this case what would be the object of the 500 varieties of the faith that are struggling for existence in this day and generation?

Christianity demands that one man must be allowed to reject the doctrines of the virgin birth, and the claims to Godhead of his Lord and Master; another the necessity of baptism by water, or the use of bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; while a sterner brand of believers insists that salvation can come only to him who abides in the common faith, and that head claims to be God's clearest agent on earth.

An illustration from secular life appears to me to be pertinent. What would "Presbyterianism" think of an army engaging in battle with the enemy, but with no head or plan of campaign, but where the Colonel of each regiment acted according to his own discretion and handled the troops under his command as in his opinion best? The result would be a chaotic plan under which modern Christianity is fighting to-day, and this is the reason why the ranks of unbelief are receiving recruits in such vast numbers.

The remedy, the only one, is a return to the practice of apostolic days, when each country had its national church, presided over and governed by an elected Bishop, priests and deacons, holding a common creed, and when in the general councils of the church each Bishop was primus inter pares, owing allegiance to and accepting guidance from the broader spirit of Almighty God.

New York, October 17. D. L.

Undenatured Hapsins.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The trimming on the hats women are now wearing is getting more ridiculous every day, more so than the style of skirts they are now wearing, and which have been considerably exploited recently in the daily papers. Getting back to the hat trimmings, quills and wings seem to be the fashion and they are tucked on in long and wavy lines that give the impression they are falling off.

As in the past, the new styles were created apparently for the purpose of making life miserable for those who could not afford the elaborate and costly hats. The wings and quills seem to have a liking for jabbing you in the face or the eye when the wearer suddenly turns to one side. While the new trimming is not quite so bad as projecting batpins in the jabbing line, it is bad enough and one must be alert to keep out of harm's way.

New York, October 18.

Strawberries the Year Round.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Fall strawberries! Gracious! They are no novelty in good Old Georgia country, where more so than the style of skirts they are now wearing, and which have been considerably exploited recently in the daily papers. Getting back to the hat trimmings, quills and wings seem to be the fashion and they are tucked on in long and wavy lines that give the impression they are falling off.

As in the past, the new styles were created apparently for the purpose of making life miserable for those who could not afford the elaborate and costly hats. The wings and quills seem to have a liking for jabbing you in the face or the eye when the wearer suddenly turns to one side. While the new trimming is not quite so bad as projecting batpins in the jabbing line, it is bad enough and one must be alert to keep out of harm's way.

Yes, if He is Silent.
TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: Is not Grover C. Cutlip, barber, of Norwood, Ohio, worthy of being appointed to trim the beards of the immortals? JOHN E. FENDLER.
MOUNT VERNON, October 18.

"THE QUEEN OF SONG."

A Recollection of Madame Sontag When She Sang "Auld Robin Grey."

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: The recent reference to Henriette Sontag (Countess of Rossi) touches a string of soft sweet recall, and the great prima donna is before me in all her beauty and grace.

It was early in 1853 that the Countess was the guest of one of New York's accomplished gentlemen, the late Mr. Marshall O. Roberts. To a young girl, to whom the world of charm was as yet a sealed book, she was a revelation, and after more than half a century she remains before me the best proof of appreciation. The son of her host, by whom Mme. Sontag was entertained and who was embarrassed by great hesitancy of speech, said to his father as she left: "What would I give to have heard her sing!" It was the first time his father had ever heard him allude to the defunct.

Soon afterward she left New York, en route for Mexico. It was reported that she had lost most of her large fortune for others and had been induced to take part in the Italian opera in Mexico, which would reimburse her. It was a great shock when the New York papers announced her sudden death from cholera at the age of 42. It was my own first great sorrow. ELIZABETH S. STREIBER.
WASHINGTON, D. C., October 18.

Mayor Gaynor on the Trial of Jesus.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: I read:

While a Justice of the Supreme Court Mayor Gaynor made an exhaustive study of the subject of the arrest and trial of Jesus. He reviewed the case from the standpoint of Jewish jurisprudence and procedure as it existed in the first century, and this paper was found in his desk in City Hall by his secretary, Robert Adamson, and printed in THE SUN.

Perhaps you will be interested in the history of the document to which this relates. Some fifteen years ago Mayor Gaynor, then a Justice of the New York Supreme Court, spent the summer in Great Barrington, Mass. He was invited to address the Thursday Morning Club and chose for his subject "The Arrest and Trial of Jesus From a Legal Standpoint." Preparation developed an incident that was entirely characteristic of the Judge. Having occasion to consult a Bible, he went to the town library, and was mildly surprised to find that the book he desired had no place on the shelves of that institution otherwise admirably equipped. He sent to the Bible House in New York City for a copy, and presented it to the library. Before he did so, however, he wrote on the fly leaf:

I have visited many libraries that lacked many books, but no one library that lacked the book, and to that I give this.

I recall that in the address as it came from his hands he began by saying that for the purposes of the legal discussion he had left out of consideration entirely the question of the divinity of Jesus, and closed with an allusion to the fact that in its intense and pathetic way that human hearts have continued to yearn and sob over it as if coming from a divine heart.

I hope that if an enlarged edition of "Mayor Gaynor's Letters and Speeches" is ever issued it will include this exegesis upon one of the most important of all human themes, and one concerning which Mayor Gaynor was exceptionally well qualified to speak.

JOSEPH HOLLESTER.
PITTSFIELD, Mass., October 17.

Kansas Farmers Saving Rain Water.

Overlin Correspondence Kansas City Star.

For many years the farmers of Decatur and surrounding counties have been saving ponds. The fall rains filled the depressions, and in a day's travel ponds appear on every hand.

Some of the dams which were not properly constructed were washed out, but since the agitation has commenced preparations are being made to construct them wherever possible and those damaged will be repaired.

It is now urged here that in building roads every section line where a culvert is put in now could easily be made to hold an abundance of water.

Gas.

From the London Chronicle.

What first struck the Lord and what? Merely because of the supposed resemblance of the product of burning carbon to the "chaos" of the Greeks. This spirit, hitherto unknown, wrote the experimenter Van Helmont in 1627, by the new name gas, and I call it so because being untamable. It is scarcely distinguishable from the chaos of the ancients. A glimpse at modern gas devices will show how far removed from untamability is the gas of to-day.

A Gold Bug in Harlem.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SUN.—Sir: What sort of a bug is this? A beetle-like creature, about an eighth of an inch long, its back a bright gold or burnished copper in effect. Over this golden back appears a casing or envelope of transparent material, somewhat like relative glass. When the *THK SUN's* naturalists assist me in determining its classification, this small golden bug was found in the kitchen of an ordinary Harlem apartment, and is so remarkable in appearance that I wish, if possible, to know more about it.

NEW YORK, October 18.

The Voice of the Ball.

(After the season is over.)

Rebeld me now.
With nothing new, for a time at least.
Do to but talk, for a time at least.
It's me for conversation when I ain't my busy day.
Now, listen, will you, while I talk About myself a bit.
Because I'm mad, though I know I certainly am it.

But let me put you wise.
There's nothing to compare with me.
Considering the symptoms of cancer, I think that the disease may be treated in time.

The earth is round like me, of course, and bigger much in girth.
But, fans and fellow citizens, say, don't I know the earth?
The sun is round like me, the moon.
The planets too, but, see, That bunch of high-ups, I don't think. Can put it over me!

I'm the spheroid on the spot.
And when I hit the circuit To start the season's play.
The whole darn solar system is bound to revolve with me.
And listen, please.
To these:
The rhino and the elephant:
Are covered thick with hide.
But, fans, their leather is the kind At which you point with pride.
There's intellect put in books, And bound in leather too.
But